ATTACHMENT C (PAGES 34-66)

8.

MR. PIROZOLLO: Yes. If I could address the downward departure, I think under the terms of the plea agreement, it's very clear that they reserved only one basis to depart downward. In the defendant's memorandum, there are arguments made as to why he's not a career offender, but the substantial meat of their argument relates to cases that are downward departures, and so it's really a downward departure argument, which is really not, I don't think, appropriately raised.

THE COURT: So if in fact --

MR. BARRON: We're in a new legal world. In fact those are the only precedent out there to discuss these issues.

THE COURT: Well, let me get to <u>Booker</u> in a minute, but I'm now applying the Guidelines. That's what I'm supposed to start with, and these are unusually, yes, not -- that's what I'm supposed to start with, and I'm going to apply the Guidelines, and then I'm going to discuss <u>Booker</u> and the reserved downward departure area, which is the psychiatric area.

Now, if in fact I find the following -Mr. Pirozzolo has very graciously not pressed the waiver
issue with respect to the financial institutions, which is
what I was coming in here expecting to do. Having heard oral
argument on the financial institutions and having applied

2

3

4

5

6

7.

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

My Bread at a time in the past, I find that the record is evenly balanced with respect to whether or not a piercing is appropriate here. Some of the My Bread factors are fully appropriate. For example, there was some intermingling of personal assets with corporate assets; that is, the country club and the house payments. However, there were other aspects which would not comply where there was not adequate proof; i.e., whether or not it was too thinly capitalized, I don't know that; what role the officer of U.S. Trust played, I don't know that; how dominant this defendant was as opposed to the other 30 employees, I don't know that. I just don't know too much. I think Mr. Pirozzolo makes a strong argument for a piercing, but based on this record, I'm not prepared to say it's by a preponderance. And I also find the issue wasn't waived because the government has waived the waiver, and I think that was gracious of it to do, even though it relied on preexisting case law.

So I also, though, don't think, while I do believe I have the authority on my own to downwardly depart, and I might otherwise have been tempted to because this was a nonviolent blackmail, and I actually don't agree with that First Circuit case -- that's the First Circuit case -- and it also is supported by a Guideline, I am going to find that he is a career offender based on the extortion/blackmail. And given everything else in his record -- in particular, the lie

```
and the blackmail occurred while on pretrial supervised
 1
     release -- I'm not going to downwardly depart. And I think
 2
 3
     that puts us at 23 and 6. Is that right?
 4
               THE PROBATION DEPARTMENT: I believe so, your
 5
     Honor.
               THE COURT: Is everyone at least on the same page
 6
     so we can start discussing the rest of this?
 . 7
 8
               THE PROBATION DEPARTMENT: Would you like me to go
     through the numbers?
 9
               THE COURT: If you could just recrunch them just to
10
11
     make sure I'm right. You did this, right? You're the one
     who worked through this? And this is fully giving the
12
     defendant the benefit of the earlier Guidelines, acceptance
13
     of responsibility, which would at least be questionable, and
14
15
     that puts us at 92 to 115.
                                Is that right?
               THE PROBATION DEPARTMENT: Yes, your Honor.
               THE COURT: And that puts us at -- supervised
    release stays the same, three to five.
              THE PROBATION DEPARTMENT: Yes, your Honor.
              THE COURT: And as far as the fine range, it puts
    us at --
              THE PROBATION DEPARTMENT:
                                         $10,000 to -- I believe
    it's $9 million.
              THE COURT:
                          $10,000 to $100,000?
              THE PROBATION DEPARTMENT: To $9 million.
```

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1 THE COURT: All right. How did it get there? 2 THE PROBATION DEPARTMENT: Because of the statutory fine provisions. 3 THE COURT: \$9 million, and a \$400 special 4 5 assessment. 6 All right, now, there are two motions for a 7 departure. The government has preserved the right to go up, 8 you've preserved the right to go down, and you're also going 9 to present your Booker arguments. 10 MR. PIROZOLLO: You want to hear the upward departure first? 11 12 THE COURT: Yes, and then the downward. MR. PIROZOLLO: Well, I think I've really covered 13 14 most of it. 15 THE COURT: That's what I meant before, I think you have. 16 17 MR. PIROZOLLO: I think that what is clear, based 18 on the calculations that have been made under the Guidelines, 19 is that the separate act of disposing of the evidence and 20 using his son to do so is clearly not taken into consideration in any of the Guidelines calculations that have 21 22 been made. It is, the government submits, very relevant to

sentencing. It ought to be taken into consideration in

imposing the sentence, and for the reasons that I've already

expressed, it is appropriate. And the government's motion is

23

24

25

for a one-level increase from the otherwise applicable Guidelines.

THE COURT: Thank you. And your downward departure, this is based on the psychiatric history and the unfortunate thing that happened to him in high school?

MR. BARRON: Yes.

THE COURT: There are people who are taking this down, so I leave it up to you as to how much you want to put on the record.

MR. BARRON: Yes, I'm going to focus less on details in the open record and leave the details to the record that's in my brief. I do want to make some comments because the government has suggested at times that they are skeptical of the events in the past. I think the record, though, that I've provided you with --

THE COURT: Well, was it a public settlement?

MR. BARRON: Yes.

THE COURT: I mean, just for the record, we're referring to the fact that -- why don't you state it.

MR. BARRON: Yes, the fact is that Mr. Alcott was abused by Father James Talbot as a child when he was fifteen years old and a student at Boston College High School.

Father Talbot has been involved in litigation in Massachusetts and in Maine. He's currently in a retreat now. He was well known. The church dealt with him in the

way it's reported to have dealt with many of these cases, which is to move him or allow him to move on to other places; and eventually, when things broke open, he's been secreted or secluded, but there are a number of people who have raised this issue. And the church put Father Talbot on a list of some 80 priests who were suspect, and they established a hot line, and one of the people they contacted was Mr. Alcott over this, over the potential that there had been abuse in the past.

Mr. Alcott obtained the services of Jeffrey Newman, an attorney, I guess, at the time at Greenberg Traurig. The case was one of a number that settled. I've put together a fair amount of information in that regard in the binder I've submitted to the Court.

There's also the picture that's very consistent with these kinds of cases. You see his grades are good as a child in middle school, they're high. He comes into high school. There's acting out. There's lots of trouble in his childhood. From that point forward, his life looks rather bad. It does fit the picture.

We have Dr. Savagian's letter. Dr. Savagian's letter does take into account many other factors, but it's something that we can't ignore. It looks from this record like it did happen. And while it's not considered an excuse, like somebody who's not criminally responsible because of a

22.

mental condition like an active bipolar disorder or schizophrenia, it's a factor. It's a environmental and sociological factor that's difficult to ignore. We're grappling with all these things Mr. Alcott has done and admitted to: the lying in open court and looking your Honor in the eye and telling you he had cancer.

THE COURT: How long ago was this with the priest, the '60s, '70s?

MR. BARRON: It was a long time ago. This was the '70s, '77, '78.

THE COURT: It's been thirty years. I mean, didn't he get treatment for it?

MR. BARRON: He did to some extent. He did to some extent, and he sought -- but never specifically sex offender treatment; in other words, somebody who's a perpetrated survivor. I think Dr. Savagian called it PTSD. To a great extent, people who are burdened with this in their lives require treatment. The problem is, they don't disclose it, and that's been seen again and again and again.

THE COURT: Sure, but I thought I read in the record that he did get psychiatric treatment for this.

MR. BARRON: He got psychiatric treatment not for this but for alcoholism and for a number of other disorders. He was reviewed when he first committed the crime, the robbery that's at the beginning of his record, but this was

not disclosed until later. It was not disclosed until Boston College made the call to him.

THE COURT: Right, and so then the question I really have is, didn't he receive some treatments after that?

MR. BARRON: No, he never received treatment after that other than counseling with Dr. Savagian.

THE COURT: Right.

MR. BARRON: And that was -- and, you know, he referred that out, and it never went anywhere. This history has not been addressed in its totality ever. He's seen psychologists starting in his school days in his early life. He went into a psychiatric hospital at one point, but this was never worked or disclosed. There were a lot of issues perhaps with his mental health but never anything conclusive.

This is a factor in the person in front of you who's done some bizarre things. I mean, this is somebody who -- this is why the career offender seems so inappropriate in some ways, appropriate in some but inappropriate in others. Here's somebody who founds a family, who has a business, who works regularly and who succeeds to some point. But then when the pressure is on, he reverts to a mode of lying and really hurting the people who are close to him. And even his banker in some sense becomes a partner in his

business.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

But this is part of the pattern of what Mr. Alcott has done. It has to do with being a child and having one's trust breached, and, you know, having one's emerging sexuality damaged in this sense. And it's a large factor in the kind of strange behavior that Mr. Alcott has been involved in. This stuff is essentially bizarre. Some of the things in that bag are so dramatic that they become silly, the voice scrambler and all this elaborate nonsense. There are probably many other ways -- I haven't sat down and thought of them -- to commit a crime, but there's this crazy sense of the dramatic. I mean, Mr. Alcott when he first robbed a bank stole \$4,000. It was the amount he needed. I mean, these are strange, strange criminal acts, and I think they're very consistent with somebody who's been sexually abused. And it's been that way throughout his history. And now we're getting somebody who's older. You know, the recidivism risk begins to fall from this point.

THE COURT: He's not a violent man in the sense of, you know, he's not going to shoot someone. He did do an armed robbery, which I don't demean for a minute. I don't care if it's a toy gun that terrifies people. But he seems to be a serial cheat, for want of a better word, a fraud, and that could continue. I read one of those letters where he said, "I can't help myself, I need to lie." The truth is,

8.

that is a concern about recidivism that he's just going to go out and commit a fraud and cheat someone else.

MR. BARRON: How much punishment is the question.
We're here accepting punishment, and these answers like
188 months are --

THE COURT: Well, but we're not there now.

MR. BARRON: Even at 100 months, it's eight years for this kind of conduct. It's very harsh for somebody with this history. This is not the person, you know, with a history of being a tough and a violent person. There's a highly personal kind of behavior. And, you know, Mr. Alcott did go straight at many times. I mean, he worked for that New Jersey firm. I gave you as much of a history as they were willing to give me. When they understood where he is, they didn't want to talk very much. But he got promoted many times. I mean, that is not somebody who makes crime a habit of life like one would originally experience with a career offender.

THE COURT: The concern is that he's made fraud a way of life.

MR. BARRON: Has he? In some senses, maybe not. I mean, there is the bank fraud and lying to the Court. I mean, in some ways, when this bank fraud started, it was meant -- he's running a legitimate business and bringing the money into the business. It's not like the person who sets

series of false payments to present.

23.

up a company solely to defraud Medicare and run through a

THE COURT: The third fraud, also called blackmail, is what he did with that guy. I mean, it's a way of cheating or defrauding. It's of concern. And I read that letter that said, "I can't help myself, I need to lie."

MR. BARRON: He gets seven years of supervised release, you know, to deal with these things. And incarcerating him and warehousing him for these long periods, I mean, he doesn't make the kinds of repayments that he's supposed to make in restitution, he sits in the institution. And, I mean, if he is a serial fraud person, he's got all this period of supervised release with the opportunity to be put back again and again.

THE COURT: What are you recommending?

MR. BARRON: Well, I mean, on the specific issue of downward departure, I'm recommending a period --

THE COURT: For a sentence.

MR. BARRON: Oh, for a sentence in toto, I think that three times the average offense for somebody involved in white collar at 48 months, plus the period of parole and the other restrictions on his liberty, adding to that the community sentence of six months, the 500-hour program, that would be a sufficient sentence. I mean, Mr. Alcott's staying inside for more than four years doesn't seem to benefit a lot

of the corrective purposes of the statute. It's harsh. It can be held up as an example, but it might even be an inconsistent example, given what the average sentences are in these kinds of cases. Yes, he's got a record, but therefore his sentence will be much higher. But to work the Guidelines as they exist and as the Department of Probation has calculated them, and as we've all calculated them, it doesn't seem to really use the correction system as well as it might. I mean --

THE COURT: Thank you.

What are you looking for, Mr. Pirozzolo?

MR. PIROZOLLO: Bottom line, our recommendation is 120 months, and that represented the midrange of the Guidelines, applicable Guideline range, had there been a total of 25. Now, the Court has already ruled that it should be a Level 23. The government, of course, is arguing for an upward departure. But under the circumstances, and based on the recommendations in the sentencing memorandum, should the Court depart upward, the government would be recommending what we said, which is the low end of the applicable Guideline range, which is 100 months, if you were to depart upward.

THE COURT: Thank you. Now, what about restitution? Help me on restitution.

MR. PIROZOLLO: As to restitution, if I may, the

bank is entitled to restitution of approximately \$2 million. 1 2 THE COURT: How much has been paid back? 3 MR. PIROZOLLO: That is net, that's a net number. THE COURT: That's a net number. Which bank is it? 5 6 MR. PIROZOLLO: South Shore Savings Bank. THE COURT: And they're the ones who are here? 7 8 MR. PIROZOLLO: Correct. 9 THE COURT: Okay. MR. PIROZOLLO: The government is not going to 10 11 press restitution with respect to Clover Capital. We've discussed this with Clover Capital. They're aware that we 12 have taken the position they're entitled to restitution, but 13 14 they are willing to forgo that for today -- well, forever. 15 THE COURT: This is it, this is it. I put this off 16 too many times. MR. PIROZOLLO: No, no, no, forever. 17 18 agreed, they've written it off. I think the prospect of Mr. Alcott repaying the \$2 million, which is the prior 19 preferred creditor, that realistically I think Clover decided 20 21 that they're not going to get that money back, and they're 22 willing to move on. 23 So \$2 million is what you're seeking in THE COURT: restitution? 24

MR. PIROZOLLO: Yes, as set forth in the PSR.

25

1	THE COURT: Is there an objection to that figure?
2	MR. BARRON: No.
3	THE COURT: Is there any other restitution?
4	MR. PIROZOLLO: No, your Honor.
5	THE COURT: Is somebody here from South Shore?
6	MR. PIROZOLLO: Yes, but I've spoken with them.
7	They don't intend to make a statement.
8	THE COURT: They don't want to make a victim
9	statement?
10	MR. PIROZOLLO: No, your Honor.
11	MR. BARRON: Before we go, are we going to be heard
12	on criminal history category at all?
13	THE COURT: I thought we had. I thought that was
14	the
15	MR. BARRON: Well, that was one area where I
16	didn't I didn't know if you were finished and were going
17	to stop altogether on the substantive
18	THE COURT: If you want to make another argument,
19	you can, but I had thought we were done too.
20	MR. BARRON: Oh, well, I didn't think we were. I
21	misread how the Court was proceeding, so
22	THE COURT: All right, I'll get to you. Let him
23	finish, and then if you think there's something else that
24	needs to be said
25	MR. PIROZOLLO: I think that I've answered the

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

go ahead.

questions you've posed, but there are a couple of things I do 1 want to be heard on with respect to the Booker arguments. 2 had understood you were going to do the departure first and .3⋅ 4 then get to the Booker arguments, but they morph, I 5 understand. THE COURT: So what else would you like to say? MR. PIROZOLLO: Well, first off, as to a departure, I don't know that the sexual abuse history is properly framed as a departure argument at all. THE COURT: Did you get in touch with the dentist from California? MR. PIROZOLLO: Yes, we did. THE COURT: And did the dentist put in any kind of statement or want to be heard? MR. PIROZOLLO: He declined to put in a statement. THE COURT: Under this new Victims Rights Act, I want to make sure that's all been followed. So the dentist, the one who was blackmailed, didn't want to be heard? MR. PIROZOLLO: We contacted him, and within the last couple of days, he declined to be heard. We'll notify him of the results, obviously. THE COURT: He never actually paid money, right? MR. PIROZOLLO: No. THE COURT: So there's no loss figure there.

MR. PIROZOLLO: As to the departure issue, it's my understanding it's actually not really even properly framed as a departure issue. It's more being presented, I believe, as a <u>Booker</u> factor. I don't know that the government --

THE COURT: Well, the psychiatric history was a reserved basis for a downward departure. The rest of it would be a <u>Booker</u> kind of argument.

MR. PIROZOLLO: Actually, no, your Honor. What was reserved in the plea agreement was a downward departure based on psychiatric history.

THE COURT: Right.

MR. PIROZOLLO: However, however, the plea agreement provided that the government would receive notice that there would be a departure motion that would be made on that ground, and the attorney for Mr. Alcott called me within the notice period and informed me that he was not going to be moving for a downward departure. And in fact, if you read the papers, he is not moving for a downward departure. The papers are framing the sexual abuse issue as a Booker factor, not a departure argument. So just so that the record is clear, this is not a departure argument. It's, rather, a Booker factor, something that should be taken into consideration for purposes of sentencing.

MR. BARRON: I called to say that the psychiatric expert we'd be using under the procedure, where we were given

30 days' notice before hearing, would not be called on the issue of another disorder that we've been talking about.

THE COURT: Did you actually file a separate motion for downward departure?

MR. BARRON: I did not file a separate motion based on that. That is, the basis of this argument is one that we've had from the beginning, however, yes.

MR. PIROZOLLO: And I understood it was going to be a component of the argument, but it's not a departure argument, your Honor, as I understand it. And I don't know that we're really in a position to address the merits of the claim, and so the record is what it is on that, and the government has nothing more to say about the facts that underlie the sexual abuse claim. However, much of the conduct that is at issue here today occurred subsequent to when this was identified, diagnosed, and he did receive some counseling for that issue.

There were two points made in the memorandum that I do want to address. The first is this notion of an average sentence, an average white collar sentence. The defense has made much of this in its papers. I don't think it's a fair characterization of this case to measure it as an average or even measure it against the average white-collar defendant. This is a person with a lengthy record. This is a person who defrauded the Court, who committed extortion while on

pretrial release, had his son try to dispose of evidence of the obstruction and of other wrongful acts. By no measure is this an average case, and it's not appropriate to compare it in any way to an average white-collar defendant.

And as to the age, as the Court has pointed out, there's this notion that Mr. Alcott is not a recidivist risk. I can think of no clearer case where there is in fact a demonstrated, documented risk of recidivism here. A person who is facing a substantial bank fraud charge goes out and commits at least two crimes while on pretrial release. There isn't a meaningful argument that can be made that he is not a recidivist. And that's all the government would say with respect to the Booker factors.

THE COURT: Thank you.

MR. BARRON: First, I want to talk about criminal history category, and one of the important things to look in this record in this categorization has been how he accumulated many of the points. There's a cluster of points in 1992 and 1993 that involve being habed in from one court to another and pleading guilty and accepting sentences of lengths that probably no defendant on the outside, so to speak, would ever accept. These are a number of financial things in his record, and I think that the accumulation of points as I calculated in my memorandum is probably more an accurate way of looking at his criminal history.

Now, I know your Honor is making the career offender finding, but I think, if I'm going to address the career offender and what criminal history category he's in and whether we should depart backward from criminal offender, we ought to be looking at those. I think that given that you've made this finding on Criminal History Category 6, you at least should go back two categories to Category 4 or Category 3 as I'd originally argued, and putting him in more of a range of 57 to 71 in Category 3 or 70 to 87 in Category 4 as a Guideline range.

These offenses are normally not ones that would have merited a jail sentence, even with a predicate conviction, 1987. They are essential financial crimes. One of them is more of a commercial dispute for failing to clear the UCC lien on a boat. He pled guilty so that he didn't keep coming back into court. I think that's fairly clear from the record. And he was given a rather lengthy sentence for that, which accumulates him three points under these calculations.

There were two other theft or bounced check type offenses. They're low. They don't register usually. And because the plea of guilty occurs when he's in incarceration, you know, that is one factor, at least, in looking at his criminal history category. And it's somewhat peculiar to Massachusetts because of this way we have of habing people in

- 8

and moving them around. The original sentence, after all, that he was given was a suspended twelve-year sentence, and I think it gives your Honor a view of how the court looked at Mr. Alcott when he committed the initial robbery from issues of the boat. He was in jail once, and essentially the way Massachusetts looks at his record is, he was paroled on the second application. And I think that has to be taken into account when we look at what criminal history category he's in. So that's why I think a lower criminal history category of two or three categories lower might be an appropriate way of looking at his sentence.

Now, viewing these, if I --

THE COURT: My big concern is, all of this would be very meritorious if it weren't for all the conduct that happened while on pretrial release. And when you say overstate, I mean, you make your bed, you lie in it. How can you trust him?

MR. BARRON: I see that, but this is what
Mr. Alcott has done under periods of extreme stress, and it
has to do with his upbringing and the way that he was treated
as a teen. I mean, we've got the psychologist letter in the
record, we have some background information; and I think that
it's not the sole determiner of your sentence, but it should
be taken into account in how we treat him. And when we have
seven years of supervised release waiting for him, that's

و .

something that we can look at now with <u>Booker</u> in terms of the overall corrective purposes of what we're doing.

And, I mean, you know, he made it through seven years of parole without any events until this recent flare-up. This seems to be episodic. Initially this was one of the reasons for my psychiatric review. We didn't pursue that because the picture, as you see it yourself, is murky, but we have these long periods of good behavior, of somebody producing. You know, he's raised two children into adulthood. He has two more. He's done things, he's been involved in their lives, they're supportive of him; and they don't understand how this man who can do well raising children, keeping a job, and keeping a family suddenly breaks down into this bizarre kind of conduct. But it's part of Mr. Alcott's history, but he does function very well.

The other thing is, he's forty-four. The statistics are what they are. I mean, that's true, Mr. Pirozzolo wants your Honor to look at these individual characteristics. But we also have to look at some other statistics, and that is -- and your Honor sees it better as a judge than any other person. "I'm getting too old for this" is the mantra that we hear from defendants once they reach their late thirties and early forties. People in their forties do not recidivate. They become less of a reoffense risk. And the fifteen-year report of the Sentencing

, **7**

Commission, which I've included portions of it, and it's available to your Honor online, is very clear about that, that career offender determinations for people at that age are not -- they do not serve the purposes of the Sentencing Reform Act. Just, as they get older, career offender determination is not as valid a basis to be applied, I guess. There isn't as valid a basis to apply career offender as somebody gets older.

THE COURT: Thank you. Does he want to say anything?

MR. BARRON: Yes.

THE COURT: Mr. Alcott, do you want to say anything? I think probably members of your family, is that right, are sitting back there?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes.

THE COURT: I've received many letters from them, a few just this morning.

THE DEFENDANT: I'd like to start by apologizing to your Honor and U.S. Attorney Pirozzolo for the awful lies. I sit here today with my head down shamed and embarrassed about what I've done. I've spent a lifetime trying to justify my actions, and with the lies about the cancer and the extortion and everything else, there's no justification, and I'm not here to try and justify it, and I apologize to you.

To Mr. McGowan at South Shore Savings Bank, I'm

sorry. I wasn't man enough to come to Mr. McGowan when the business started going bad. I wasn't man enough to accept the failure, and I hope that I won't affect the way that you do business with future clients because you became a friend and a partner, and it made you special, and I'm sorry that I violated your trust.

I'm sorry to all my friends and family and community, how my actions and my lies have hurt a lot of people.

Your Honor, one thing that's brought me happiness in my life is my role as a father. Although I was divorced when my older children were toddlers, I remained close, and I was emotionally loving and financially supportive. And my daughter Kerry is here today. She's a wonderful girl who is respected and loved by many. But I'm embarrassed. I'm embarrassed that I tried to share my mistakes with my kids, but I now realize that I raised them with a philosophy of "Do what I say, not what I do," and that's been wrong.

I've hurt a lot of people but nobody as bad as my beautiful wife Mary and my twin babies, Emma and Harrison.

Emma and Harrison don't know where daddy is anymore, and they miss him terrible. Mary has had to move halfway across the country to be near her family and for love and support.

She's not just been hurt by me; she's been humiliated. Yet she remains loving and supportive. Thank you.

3

4

5

6

7

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

I only wish that I had the tools at the time to see the consequences of my actions because I never would have given up this beautiful family just to succeed financially. Since I've been in Plymouth for the last eleven months, I've spent a lot of time looking at myself, seeing who I am and who I want to be, and I don't want to be this person I don't want to lie. I don't want to hurt people. anymore.

I look in the mirror now and I see the imperfections that I never saw, and I feel the pain, pain that I haven't felt since 1976 when I met Father Talbot. was a young man from an alcoholic and abusive household searching for a mentor, and I thought, who better than my teacher, coach, and priest? And he wasn't a mentor. He was an animal, he was a predator, and he took a lot of my life away, and he took my self-esteem away.

And you addressed the issue today, your Honor, of, well, hasn't he gotten psychiatric help for this? acknowledge myself as a victim until 2002. I had gotten psychiatric help for issues that I had no idea why they existed. I knew that when the pressure hit, I didn't act normal, and I would go to therapy; but I never brought that out until 2002, already in the middle of my financial crisis and the fraud with the bank. I now understand that I suffer from post-traumatic stress disorder, and I need regular therapy to address these issues and to center on these

issues.

12.

Also while at Plymouth, the doctor at Plymouth has diagnosed me for the first time with bipolar disorder. As my attorney mentioned, that was not brought out today because there's a conflict of some different diagnosis. But I'm currently on lithium and Prozac for the bipolar, and I'm excited by the results. For the first time in my life, the post-traumatic stress disorder and the bipolar make sense of what I've done in my life and what I have to do to change it. And I know that what I have to do is stay on medication, get regular therapy, attend Alcoholics Anonymous which I have been sober for thirteen years through, and address gambling addiction, probably through Alcoholics Anonymous.

The last thing I'd say is that my wife several months ago sent me a quote that's on my cell wall. It's from George Elliot, and it says, "it's never too late to be what you could have been." If I read that over a year ago, I would have thought of houses, cars, money, success, because I believed I needed that for anybody to love me. I'm sorry I thought that. Now I know that what I need to be to be loved is honest and unconditionally loving. And when I read that quote today, all I want to be is an honest and supportive husband and father. I want to be called "Daddy" again.

So, your Honor, I know that today the Guidelines come to a significant amount of incarceration. I would ask

14.

you to use your discretion and give me less incarceration with alternative sentencing. I'd ask you to give me supervised release incorporating everything that's been mentioned: restitution, parental responsibility, medication, therapy, AA. I'd ask you to help me to try and be a father to my children.

I thank you for your time today, your Honor.

THE COURT: Thank you. This is one of the best apologies that I've heard in a very long time, and it makes me feel sad that you really have thrown your life away. Your attorney represented in the memo that you were very bright and showed huge promise at Boston College High School. Then after the sexual abuse, your grades dropped, and you essentially fell apart as a person. And I'm going to assume for a minute that that's all true. I think the record plays that out. But that was thirty years ago, and while I pity you for that and you're still suffering from that, you have to move on with your life because all of these crimes happened within the last what, five years?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes.

THE COURT: You have this loving family. I got letters from Kerry and a nephew and your family. I mean, they've loved you. And yet all I've seen -- you know, sort of you make your bed, you lie in it kind of thing -- is one bad act after another. And so it's hard for me to evaluate

3.

9.

how much of this eloquence is heartfelt, which it seems to be right now, and how much of it is just for the moment because what I've seen are one act after another.

This isn't your typical white-collar case, and in fact, given your history, I might have been right where Mr. Barron wants me to be if we didn't have these other things. The letters to that dentist were horrible. I mean, you didn't mention that horrible blackmail. And standing here looking me in the face, having me almost jump on Mr. Pirozzolo for looking for a life sentence for a fraud because you were dying of cancer, you were taking advantage of me.

THE DEFENDANT: Yes.

THE COURT: And the issues with respect to your family, I read some of those letters, et cetera, what happened with your family. I mean, you have lived a life of lying and cheating and fraud in a way that I hope you go beyond, because I hear a man with a great heart, now that I'm hearing you do some of this internal reflection. But, you know, it's sort of like I see what you've done, and that's speaking louder to me than the words that you just articulated.

On the other hand, I do appreciate that apology.

don't usually get an apology like that, both to the family

and to me. I do think that you've had the sexual abuse

problem with the priest, and I'm not inclined to upwardly depart. I'm not inclined to go to the high end of the Guidelines. I'm balancing the various acts in not downwardly departing because I don't view this as overstating the criminal history, actually, given the serial nature of what's happened here, but I don't see any basis for upwardly departing or going to the high end.

It's a mixed bag here, but I am going to do the following: I am going to impose incarceration of 92 months, which is the absolute lowest end and I think is fair and appropriate here, evaluating all the 3553(a) factors, which weigh both ways, the last six months of which are served as a consecutive sentence pursuant to U.S.S.G. 25, whatever it is; the fact that one of the crimes, in fact probably the most serious of the crimes, the extortion and blackmail, happened while on supervised release from the Court. Five years of supervised release, subject to Alcoholics Anonymous, mental health counseling, gambling counseling, and with a special focus on the sexual abuse to try and work that through.

Is there a special program to deal with that? I want that focused on.

THE PROBATION DEPARTMENT: The Probation Office would have to work with the psychiatrist.

THE COURT: The last six months I can do for -- is that the acceptable way of segmenting this?

THE PROBATION DEPARTMENT: Yes.

THE COURT: -- for the fact that one of the crimes was done while on the supervised release of the court, which is one of the things that I'm doing, I take with particular gravity. No fine because I think a fine would be impossible to pay in this situation. \$2 million restitution to the South Shore Savings Bank.

THE PROBATION DEPARTMENT: Your Honor, I believe the number, if I'm correct, is \$2,032,345.60.

THE COURT: Say it again?

THE PROBATION DEPARTMENT: \$2,032,345.60.

THE COURT: Payable to South Shore, and a \$400 special assessment.

MR. BARRON: There is some concerns about a judicial recommendation to Minnesota to Rochester.

THE COURT: A judicial recommendation to Minnesota, and I would be amenable to transferring supervised release out there if the family decides to stay in Minnesota, which might be a good thing to get away from all of this.

MR. BARRON: He has a very significant history of alcoholism. It's throughout his record. Going way back, there are OUIs, and drinking has been a big problem. Could he be recommended to the so-called 500-hour program?

THE COURT: Yes.

MR. BARRON: With a specific statement of that in

the judgment? 1 2 THE COURT: Yes, the 500-hour alcohol program. don't see any history of drug abuse. 3 MR. BARRON: No. It's alcohol. 4 5 THE COURT: And the issue that's striking me a 6 little bit is, I don't know what to do with his bipolar 7 piece. MR. BARRON: I think if he were in Rochester, it's 8 an FMC, there they can look at it more. We have some 9 10 disagreements from the doctors. This is an open session, so I haven't gone into it in greater detail, but you have --11 12 THE COURT: He was excellent here, better than -- I mean, and I'm wondering whether the drugs actually have made 13 14 a difference, compared to the way I've seen him in the past. At this point we now have a record, and so maybe he should be 15 16 evaluated at a federal medical center. 17 MR. BARRON: I think that going to Rochester would 18 help that. He is on mood-stabilizing drugs, yes, the lithium and the Prozac. 19 THE COURT: So why don't we recommend an evaluation 20 at the FMC. 21 MR. BARRON: Yes. 22 23 THE COURT: Anything else on supervised release? The standard financial conditions, the other standard 24

25

conditions, yes.

THE PROBATION DEPARTMENT: Yes.

THE COURT: Anything else?

MR. PIROZOLLO: Just as to the designation, I just want to note for the record that's really a matter for BOP, your Honor. I know that the Court can make a recommendation --

THE COURT: I will make that recommendation. They try and give it weight.

MR. PIROZOLLO: But as to whose authority it is, it's ultimately BOP's authority to determine where he should serve.

THE COURT: I actually know that, okay? I know that. I can't promise it, but I'm going to recommend it.

MR. BARRON: We understand, and I've explained to Mr. Alcott. But it looks like a good fit. It's not an overpopulated area. I've done some research into it.

THE COURT: It makes sense. His family is out there. He needs to build that again with the twins. And it makes sense for someone to look at this mental health situation. It's very hard for me to believe that thirty years later, after some counseling, et cetera, this is all about dealing with that priest. It makes me think that someone else should look at it to see whether there's another issue going on.

Mr. Alba?

1 THE CLERK: Will the defendant please stand. 2 Mr. Michael Alcott, the Court hereby notifies you of your right to appeal the sentence. If you cannot afford the cost 3 4 of an appeal, you may move to proceed in forma pauperis. 5 you cannot afford counsel for an appeal, one will be 6 appointed for you. You are also notified that the Clerk of 7 Court will file an appeal on your behalf if requested by you 8 to do so. Any appeal from the sentence must be filed within 9 ten days of entry of judgment on the docket. 10 Do you understand these rights? 11 THE DEFENDANT: Yes. THE CLERK: Thank you. 12 Court is in recess. 13 (Adjourned, 10:35 a.m.) 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24

25

CERTIFICATE 1 3. UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT) DISTRICT OF MASSACHUSETTS 4 ss. CITY OF BOSTON 5 6 7 I, Lee A. Marzilli, Official Federal Court 8 Reporter, do hereby certify that the foregoing transcript, 9 10 Pages 1 through 65 inclusive, was recorded by me 11 stenographically at the time and place aforesaid in Criminal No. 04-10286-PBS, United States of America Vs. 12 13 Michael W. Alcott, and thereafter by me reduced to typewriting and is a true and accurate record of the 14 15 proceedings. In witness whereof I have hereunto set my hand this 16 17 4th day of July, 2006. 18 19 20 21 22 23 MARZILLA, CRR OFFICIAL FEDERAL COURT REPORTER 24 25